

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 9-12, 14-17, 19, 23-26, 28, 33-36, and 38 are pending and stand rejected. In this response, Claims 6, 7, 13, 20, 21, 27, 29, 30, and 37 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9-12, 14, 15, 23-26, 28, 33, and 37 have been amended. Based on the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and pass the application on to issuance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15-17, 20, 21, 25, and 26 under §103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,453,127 issued to Wood in view of USPN 6,154,843 issued to Hart. It is initially noted that Claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 have been cancelled and will not be addressed.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; that there is a reasonable expectation of success; and that the prior art reference (or references when combined) teach or suggest **all** the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142.

As is made clear below and in view of the amendments, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case for obviousness as Wood and Hart fail to teach one or more elements of each of Claims 1-3, 11, 12, 15-17, 25, and 26.

Claims 1 and 15: Claim 1, as is directed to a method for mediating access to production options and, as amended, recites the following acts.

1. acquiring a user's access request for a production device;
2. accessing data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access, each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented affects a manner in which the production device produces a target document;
3. retrieving a user interface for the production device, the user interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for the production device;

4. modifying the retrieved user interface according to the accessed data so that the interface provides user accessible controls for selecting only those options for which the user has permission to access; and
5. presenting the user with the modified user interface

Claim 15, as amended, is directed to a computer program product that includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for performing the elements listed above.

The limitations corresponding to the acts of retrieving and modifying we added by amendment and taken from Claims 7 and 21 (now cancelled). Addressing Claims 7 and 21, the Examiner mistakenly asserts that Hart, column 6, lines 12-34 teaches “modifying the interface according to the accessed data providing user accessible controls for only those options the user has permission to access.” To illustrate the Examiner’s misunderstanding, the cited passage from Hart is reproduced below.

At step 232, the local computing device 130 generates a custom network page that includes custom programs unique to the task requested by the remote user in response to the command request made in step 230. The customized program may include, but is not limited to, data specific to the private network 140, a custom user interface specific to the type of command access requested, and custom program code specifically designed to support information gathering from the remote user and to support executing the requested command or commands on the private network 140 by way of local computing device 130. In the preferred embodiment, the custom programs include a customized Web page that is HTML compatible and that contains custom Web page type interface support and network specific data necessary to supply the remote network administrator with the interface tools and network specific information that are unique to the private network 140. Further, the custom Web page and custom programs are expressly limited to the scope of the requested task that the remote user is authorized to perform. The data specific to the private network 140 may include network configuration details, network administration parameters, and/or machine or node specific information such as passwords or network address information.

Hart, col. 6, lines 12-34.

The cited passage merely discusses the generation of a custom network page that includes custom programs. A custom program can include network information, a user interface, and custom program code. Such a custom program can take the form of a web

page. The passage speaks only to the generation of a program/web page. The passage neither mentions nor suggests the modification of a retrieved program/web page.

As such Hart fails to teach or suggest “**modifying the retrieved user interface** according to the accessed data so that the interface provides user accessible controls for selecting only those options for which the user has permission to access.” Wood is silent on this point. For at least these reasons, Claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the cited references as are Claims 2, 3, 5 and 9-12 which depend from Claim 1 and Claims 16, 17, 19, and 23-26 which depend from Claim 15.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103: The Examiner rejected Claims 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 23, 24, 27-30, 33, and 34 under §103 as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Hart and in further view of USPN 6,751,657 issued to Zothner. It is initially noted that Claims 13, 27, 29, and 30 have been cancelled and will not be addressed.

Claims 5, 9, and 10 each depend from Claim 1 and are patentable over the cited references based at least on their dependence from Claim 1.

Claims 14 and 28: Claim 14 is directed to a method for mediating access to production options and recites the following:

1. acquiring a user's access request for a production device;
2. retrieving a web page for the production device, the web page having user accessible controls for selecting production options;
3. accessing a record established for the user, the record containing data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access, each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented affects a manner in which the production device produces a target document; and
4. modifying the retrieved web page according to the user's record so that the web page provides user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access; and

5. presenting the user with the modified web page so that through the web page the user can cause the production of the target document by the production device in accordance with a selection of one or more of the user accessible controls provided by the user interface..

Claim 28 is directed to a computer program product that includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for performing the elements listed above.

As discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 15, Wood and Hart fail to teach or suggest “modifying the retrieved web page according to the user’s record so that the web page provides user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access.” Zothner is also silent on this point. For at least the same reasons Claims 1 and 15 are patentable, so are Claims 14 and 28.

Claims 19, 23, and 24 each depend from Claim 15 and are patentable over the cited references based at least on their dependence from Claim 15.

Claim 33: Claim 33 is directed to a system for managing electronic document production and, as amended, recites the following elements:

1. a production server operable to serve to a client an interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for a target document, each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented affects a manner in which a selected production device produces a target document;
2. a permission service operable to retrieve the interface from the production server for the selected production device, access a user’s record containing data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access, modify the retrieved interface according to the user’s record so that the modified interface has user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access, and direct to the client the modified interface so that through the interface the user can cause the production of the target

document by the selected production device in accordance with a selection of one or more of the user accessible controls provided by the modified interface.

As discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 15, Wood and Hart fail to teach or suggest “modifying the retrieved web page according to the user’s record so that the web page provides user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access.” Zothner is also silent on this point. Consequently, the cited references also fail to teach or suggest a permission service that is operable to modify the retrieved interface according to the user’s record so that the modified interface has user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access. For at least the same reasons Claims 1 and 15 are patentable, so is Claim 33.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103: The Examiner rejected Claims 35-38 under §103 as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Hart and in further view of Zothner and in further view of USPN 6,092,078 issued to Adolfsson. It is initially noted that Claim 37 had been cancelled and will not be addressed.

Claims 35 and 36 each depend from Claim 33 and include all of the limitations of that base claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 33 is patentable, so are Claims 35 and 36.

Claim 38: Claim 38 is directed to a system for managing electronic document production and includes the following combination of elements:

1. a production device;
2. one or more user records, each user record containing, for each production device, data that at least indirectly identifies those production options to which the user does not have permission to access, each production option corresponding to feature that when implemented affects a manner in which the production device produces a target document;

3. a production server in communication with the production device and operable to serve an interface for that production device, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting production options for the production device;
4. a permission service operable to access the user's record, retrieve the interface from the production server, modify the retrieved interface according to the user's record so that the modified interface has user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access, and to direct to a client the modified interface so that through the modified interface the user can cause the production of the target document by the selected production device in accordance with a selection of one or more of the user accessible controls provided by the modified interface;
5. one or more device records, each device record containing data representing the production options offered by the production device;
6. a permission engine operable to parse the device records and generate an web page for managing user records;
7. a device locator operable to detect new production devices; and
8. an update service operable to create a device record for each newly detected production device.

As discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 15, Wood and Hart fail to teach or suggest "modifying the retrieved web page according to the user's record so that the web page provides user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access." Zothner and Adolfsson are also silent on this point. Consequently, the cited references also fail to teach or suggest a permission service that is operable to modify the retrieved interface according to the user's record so that the modified interface has user accessible controls for only those options for which the user has permission to access. For at least the same reasons Claims 1 and 15 are patentable, so is Claim 38.

Conclusion: In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell Sterling Simpson, et al.

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

January 23, 2007